



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,326	03/16/2001	Jon L. Cook	08049.0006	5362
22852	7590	02/08/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			COSIMANO, EDWARD R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/809,326

**Applicant(s)**

COOK ET AL

**Examiner**

Edward R. Cosimano

**Art Unit**

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-100 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/25/04; 9/1/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Applicant should note the changes to patent practice and procedure:
  - A) effective December 01, 1997 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 62, No. 197, Friday October 10, 1997;
  - B) effective November 07, 2000 as published in the Federal Register, Vol 65, No. 54603, September 08, 2000; and
  - C) Amendment in revised format, Vol. 1267 of the Official Gazette published February 25, 2003.
2. Applicant's claim for the benefit of an earlier filing data under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) is acknowledged.
3. Claims 11-43 & 54-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - 3.1 In regard to claims 11-43 & 54-100, although one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention would know how to accomplish each of the individual recited actions/functions from the language of these claims, since, there is no clear and definite interconnection between one or more of the recited limitations of these claims, one of ordinary skill could not determine from the language of these claims whether or not they are in fact making and/or using the claimed invention. In this regard it is noted that from the language of these claims it is vague, indefinite and unclear:
    - A) in regard to claims 11, 14, 54, 57, 89 & 90, and which "address of the user" is sent to the "address database", since the invention as recited in these claims recites both a "standard physical address of the user" in the database and an "address of the user" that is contained in the electronic account.
    - B) in regard to claims 11, 14, 17, 54 & 60, and from where is the "delivery point key" received, since the invention as recited in these claims does not recite that a delivery point key has ever been entered, inputted, determined, set forth, or indicated so that the invention may receive a delivery point code/identification.

C) in regard to claims 11, 14, 17, 54, 57, 60, 88 & 90, and how the “delivery point key” may be used to access the “address database”, since the invention as recited in these claims does not recite that:

(1) the “delivery point key” is either sent or received by the “static address database”; and

(2) the “address database” is indexed to the “delivery point key” so that the “delivery point key” may be used to access the “static address database”.

D) in regard to claims 21, 64, 92 & 99, and how, why and under what circumstances would the received “physical message” be converted to “electronic format” and sent to the determined “electronic address that corresponds to the physical address of the recipient, since it is unlawful for the Post Office to redirect mail to somewhere other than where the mail has been addressed.

E) in regard to claim 34, 77, 93 & 100, and how, why and under what circumstances would the received “electronic message” be converted to “physical format” and sent to the determined “physical address that corresponds to the electronic address of the recipient, since it is unlawful for a mail service to redirect email to somewhere other than where the email has been addressed.

F) in regard to claim 87, and why the “standardized physical address” that was obtained from the “address matching database” by using the “address matching engine” is sent back to the “address matching engine, noted the limitation “a sending module configured to send the standardized physical address from the address matching directory database to the address matching engine”.

3.2 Claims not specifically mentioned above, inherit the defects of the base claim through dependency. For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

4. 35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Art Unit: 3629

4.1 Claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.1.1 The instant claims recite a system, (claims 44-63 & 94-98), and a method comprising a series of steps to be performed, (claims 1-20), and a manufacture comprising program code to be executed by a computer, (claims 87-93), which have a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts. Further, the instant claims do not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon.

4.1.2 In regard to claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98, the invention as set forth in these claims merely describes:

A) in regard to claims 1-5, 44-48, 87 & 94, a method/system/manufacture that performs the functions of obtaining first information that is used to search a database for second information that is linked to the source of the first information.

B) in regard to claims 6-10, 49-53, 88 & 95, a method/system/manufacture that performs the functions of obtaining first information that is stored and used to search a database for second information.

C) in regard to claims 11-13, 54-56, 89 & 96, a method/system/manufacture that performs the functions of obtaining first information that is sent to a created database, where the created database is search based on received first information to obtain second information.

D) in regard to claims 14-16, 57-59, 90 & 97, a method/system/manufacture that performs the functions of obtaining first information that is sent to a database, where the database is search based on received first information to obtain second information.

D) in regard to claims 17-20, 60-63, 91 & 98, a method/system/manufacture that performs the functions of obtaining first information that is sent to a database, where the database is search based on received second information to obtain third information.

Art Unit: 3629

However, the process/system/manufacture as recited in these claims does not require the result of either the claim as a whole or the manipulations of data as recited in these claims be applied in any manner so as to be tangibly used in a concrete manner and hence to produce a useful concrete and tangible result, that is a concrete and tangible application with in the technological or useful arts.

4.1.3 It is further noted that applicant has not recited in these claims a specific process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, which is either:

- A) altered or changed or modified by the invention recited in claims; or
- B) utilizes the result of the invention recited in these claims; or
- C) is operated or controlled by the result of the invention recited in these claims.

4.1.4 It is further noted in regard to claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98, that as claimed applicant has not claimed:

A) pre computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data, which originates from an unknown source, is manipulated or transformed/changed before it is processed; or

B) post computer processing, since the claims fail to recited that the data which represents the result of the claimed manipulation, is neither manipulated nor used nor changed by any device after it has been processed; or

C) a practical use of the claimed invention by any physical system or device or method outside of a statement of the intended use of the claimed invention; or

D) process steps or physical acts/operations that would affect the internal operation of a computer/machine as were found to be statutory in either In re McIlroy 170 USPQ 31 (CCPA, 1971) or In re Waldbaum 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA, 1972); or

E) process steps or physical acts/operations that would be considered as going beyond the manipulation of "abstract ideas" as were found to be non-statutory in In re Warmerdam 31 USPQ2d 1754 (CAFC, 1994); or

F) a concrete and tangible practical application of either:

- (1) the invention as a whole; or

(2) the final results of the manipulations/actions with in the technological or useful arts;

note In re Sarkar 200 USPQ 132 (CCPA, 1978) where the process step of “constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model” was held to be so tenuous connected to the remaining process steps as to not be a process with in the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Hence, the invention of claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98 is merely directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that manipulates an abstract idea of manipulating data into and out of various databases with out requiring something to be done with the data and hence the invention is with out a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the abstract idea, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578; and State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)).

4.1.5 It is further noted that the type/nature of either the data or the calculated numbers does not affect the operation of the claimed invention and hence are considered to be non function descriptive material, (note In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

4.1.6 In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

A) consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or

B) simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (Schrader, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759),

without some claimed practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea.

4.1.7 In view of the above analysis claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98, as a whole, are directed to an hypothetical mental exercise that merely manipulates mathematics or an abstract idea without a claimed concrete and tangible practical application of the mathematics or abstract idea, and hence are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 3629

4.2 Claims 87-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.2.1 The instant claims recite a system/device/manufacture, (claims 87-93), which has a disclosed practical application in the technological or useful arts, and which does not merely define either a computer program, a data structure, non-functional descriptive material, (i.e. mere data) or a natural phenomenon. Hence, the instant claims merely define device/manufacture that contains a data structure comprising series of steps or acts or functions or operations that as claimed could be but are not necessarily to be performed by a computer.

4.2.2 It is further noted that applicant has not recited a specific machine since the steps or acts or functions or operations recited in the claim are merely to illustrate the steps or acts or functions or operations of the instant invention since these steps or acts or functions or operations as claimed are not in fact implemented by a processor/computer. Hence, applicant envisions the invention as recited in claims 87-93 as a disembodied storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a computer program as a non-functional data structure. Such a disembodied storage device is not a specific machine because:

A) it is not associated with a computer in such a way as to cause the computer to operate in a specific manner, (note In re Beauregard 35 USPQ2d 1383 (CAFC 1995) and the associated claims of U.S. Patent 5,710,578); and

B) a memory device alone can not perform the functions recited within the claims.

Therefore, the recited disembodied storage device, which itself can not perform the functions recited within the claims as the invention, is inoperative and lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

4.2.3 In view of the above, the invention recited in claims 87-93, merely describes an abstract idea of a disembodied storage device, i.e. memory, that stores a computer program as a non-functional data structure, since a disembodied storage device by itself can not produce a concrete and tangible result by performing the functions recited within the claims as the invention (State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc. 47 USPQ2d 1596 (CAFC 1998)). Hence, claims 87-93 do not have a claimed practical application, since the



Art Unit: 3629

disembodied storage device is inoperative and therefore lacks utility for the purpose of the invention.

4.2.4 Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. Cf. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability). Common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are:

- a computer-readable storage medium that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material, such as music or a literary work, encoded on the medium;
- a computer that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the machine functions (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the computer), or
- a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.

4.2.5 Hence, claims 87-93 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.3 Claims 11-43 & 54-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.3.1 As set forth by the Court in:

A) *In re Musgrave* 167 USPQ 280 at 289-290 (CCPA 1970), “We cannot agree with the Board that these claims (all the steps of which can be carried out by the disclosed apparatus) are directed to non-statutory processes merely because some or all of the steps therein can also be carried out in or with the aid of the human mind or because it may be necessary for one performing the process to think. All that is necessary, in our view, to make a sequence of operational steps a statutory “process” within 35 U.S.C. 101 is that it be in the technological arts so as to be in consonance with the Constitutional purpose to

Art Unit: 3629

promote the progress of "useful arts." Cons. Art. 1, sec. 8.", {emphasis added}; and

B) In re Sarkar 100 USPQ 132 @ 136-137 (CCPA 1978), echoing the Board of Appeals stated in regard to claim 14 "14. A method of locating an obstruction in an open channel to affect flow in a predetermined manner comprising:

a) obtaining the dimensions of said obstruction which affect the parameters of flow;

b) constructing a mathematical model of at least that portion of the open channel in which said obstruction is to be located in accordance with the method of claim 1 using those dimensions obtained in step (a) above;

c) adjusting the location of said obstruction within said mathematical model until the desired effect upon flow is obtained in said model; and thereafter

d) constructing said obstruction within the actual open channel at the specified adjusted location indicated by the mathematical model.";

and "Concerning claims 14-39 and the significance of "post-solution activity," like building a bridge or dam, the board concluded: While it is true that the final step in each of these claims makes reference to the mathematical result achieved by performing the prior recited steps, we consider the connection to be so tenuous that the several steps recited in each claim when considered as a whole do not constitute a proper method under the statute.", {emphasis added}.

4.3.2 Further, it is noted in regard to claims 14-39 of Sarkar, although step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar references the result of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar it is clear from the language of step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar that multiple adjustments to the location of the obstruction are required to be made until a location with the desired effect has been determined. Hence, the reference to constructing the obstruction at the "specified adjusted location" in step (d) of claim 14 of Sarkar is vague, indefinite and unclear in regard to which one of the possible

Art Unit: 3629

multiple adjusted locations of the obstruction that were used during step (c) of claim 14 of Sarkar would be used when constructing the obstruction as required by step (d) of Sarkar. Therefore, without a clear connection between step (d) of Sarkar and the remaining steps of claim 14 of Sarkar, the Board of Appeals and the Court held that these claims were not a process within the meaning of process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101 and hence were directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4.3.3 As can be seen from claims 11-43 & 54-100, these claims are directed to a series of devices for performing various functions or steps/actions/functions, which as set forth above in regard to the rejection of claims 11-43 & 54-100 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, are not clearly and definitely interconnected to one another and therefore do not provide an operative useful machine/system or method/process within the meaning of machine or process as used in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

4.4 Claims 11-43 & 54-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as claimed is directed to non-statutory subject matter, since:

A) in regard to claims 11-43 & 54-100, these claims fail to comply with the "requirements of this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as set forth above.

B) in regard to claims 1-100, these claims fail to comply with the "requirements of this title, namely 35 U.S.C. § 102 as set forth below.

5. Claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-97 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claim 19-47, 83-103, 116, 117, 123 & 124 of copending Application No. 09/809,328. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

5.1 The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

A) a system that uses some type of identification to retrieve a physical address for some from a database.

Art Unit: 3629

Where the difference occurs in the information that is being used as the identification. However, since the nature of this information does not affect the operation of the claimed invention, this information is deemed to be nonfunctional descriptive material. Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. Cf. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability). Common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are:

- a computer-readable storage medium that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material, such as music or a literary work, encoded on the medium;
- a computer that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the machine functions (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the computer), or
- a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.

5.2 The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

5.3 A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 3629

5.4 Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.1 Claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either Mihm et al (5,387,783) or Shinrani et al (JP 10-124488).

6.1.1 In regard to claims 1-20, 44-63 & 87-98, either Mihm et al ('783) or Shinrani et al ('488) disclose a computer implemented system/method that under the control of a program stored in memory would use obtained address information, for example, the postal code on the item of mail, to form a query that is used to access a previously created database of information that correlates old address information to new/correct address information for the same physical delivery address. Once the old address information has been converted to a query, the query is applied to the database so as to lookup/search the database for the corrected/updated address information that corresponds to the old address information. If the corrected/updated address information is found in the data base, then the updated/corrected address information replaces the old address information. It is noted that the updated/corrected information may be a "standardized physical address" so that each of the different physical addresses are stored in the same format.

6.1.2 In regard to the references to an "electronic account" and "delivery point information" or "delivery point identification key", since, neither:

A) the source of the information used to form the query that is used to look up the new information; nor

B) the nature of the data in the query;

Art Unit: 3629

would affect the operation of the claimed invention as a whole, these features of the claimed invention are deemed to be nonfunctional descriptive material upon which patentability can not be based. Nonfunctional descriptive material cannot render nonobvious an invention that would have otherwise been obvious. Cf. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (when descriptive material is not functionally related to the substrate, the descriptive material will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability). Common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are:

- a computer-readable storage medium that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material, such as music or a literary work, encoded on the medium;
- a computer that differs from the prior art solely with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the machine functions (i.e., the descriptive material does not reconfigure the computer), or
- a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.

6.2 Claims 22-43, 64-86, 99 & 100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Manduley (5,648,916).

6.2.1 In regard to claims 22-43, 64-86, 99 & 100, Manduley ('916) disclose a computer implemented system/method that under the control of a program stored in memory would process communications of various types, for example, facsimiles, physical mail, and e-mail. To this end, when a document/communication of one type arrives, the system of Manduley ('916) would determine the recipient of the document/communication and then use the determined recipient information to:

- A) access a database that correlated a recipient to both a physical and electronic address; and
- B) obtain the recipient's preferences that are stored in the database.

Art Unit: 3629

Next the document whether physical or electronic would be converted to either an electronic document or a physical document as indicated by the recipient's preferences. After this conversion is complete, then either:

A) the converted electronic document is transmitted electronically to the recipient at the recipient's electronic address as for example an e-mail; or

B) the physical document are physically delivered to the recipient at the recipient's physical address.

7. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) Agraharam et al (6,654,448) discloses converting received identification information into a e-mail address by using the received information to access a data base that correlates an e-mail address to a particular type of identification information.

B) Bruce et al (6,741,724) discloses scanning information, converting the information into electronic form and using the converting information to access the Post Offices NCO and Zipcode data bases to obtain corrected information for processing mail.

8. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

Art Unit: 3629

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (703) 305-9783. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (703)-308-2702. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

9.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

9.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

9.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

02/05/05



Edward R. Cosimano

Primary Examiner A.U. 3629